

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Appropriate correction has been made and claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 are now believed to be allowable in this respect.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 & 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 16 under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Blonder US Application No. 5,559,961. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above amendment and the following explanations is respectfully requested.

The present invention discloses an invention which relates to the use of the human memory as a security and/or identification mechanism. With the present invention a user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability to recall primitives previously imprinted to him.

More specifically, the present invention provides a method wherein the user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability *to discriminate between a primitive, previously imprinted to him and a primitive, which was not imprinted to him before*. For example, the present application describes the utilization of visual recognition of previously shown images from a plurality of images, taken from a very large database of images, for determining if the user should be allowed to access a computer system (page 11, line 25-page 13, line 6)

Blonder Us Patent application no. 5,559,961 as described in the summary of the invention section, on page 1, lines 47-55, and illustrated in Fig. 4, introduces a graphical password arrangement wherein a user seeking an access to resource is presented with a predetermined image on a visual display and is required to point to

one or more predetermined positions on the displayed image, in predetermined order as a way of indicating his or her authorization to access the resource.

However, Blonder never teaches or even hints at a method to a method wherein the user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability *to discriminate between a primitive, previously imprinted to him and a primitive, which was not imprinted to him before*. Furthermore, Blonder never suggests or even hints at the idea of *determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security*, which is taught by the present invention, for example on page 13, line 31: " In stage 5, the user selects an image that has been shown before, preferably one image of a group of images, only one of which was displayed during the training session. In a group of k images, the chance of an imposter (individual who is guessing) being correct is $1/k$. Even for $k = 2$ after 6 trials the imposter's chances of being correct every time are less than 1 in 50, but for $k = 7$, the imposter is expected to guess correctly in four successive trials less than one time in 2000. Thus, if the process is repeated, then the chance of guessing correctly is reduced significantly".

Claim 1 defines a method for providing a security function with a user, comprising: imprinting the user with at least one cryptographic primitive determined from a sensory mechanism, determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security, and at least one of authorizing, identifying or authenticating the user according to an ability to recall discriminate between the at least one imprinted cryptographic primitive and at least one non-imprinted primitive, the at least one imprinted primitive and the at least one non-imprinted primitive being presented to the user in the number of presentation steps.

Blonder never teaches or even hints at such a method wherein the user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability *to discriminate between a primitive, previously imprinted to him and a primitive, which was not imprinted to him before*. Furthermore, Blonder never suggests or even hints at the idea of *determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security*.

Claim 10 defines a method for authenticating, authorizing, or identifying a user. The method comprising: training the user with information through a sensory mechanism, determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security, and determining accurate discrimination between at least one imprinted primitive and at least one non-imprinted primitive, to authenticate, authorize or identify the user, the at least one imprinted primitive and the at least one non-imprinted primitive being presented to the user in the number of presentation steps.

As described above, Blonder never teaches or even hints at such a method wherein the user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability *to discriminate between a primitive, previously imprinted to him and a primitive, which was not imprinted to him before*. Furthermore, Blonder never suggests or even hints at the idea of *determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security*.

Claim 11 defines a method for a one-way function for authenticating, authorizing or identifying a user, comprising: imprinting the user with a cryptographic primitive, determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security, and testing the imprinting with at least a similar or identical cryptographic primitive to authenticate, authorize or identify the user, wherein the testing comprises determining whether the user is capable of discriminating between at least one imprinted primitive and at least one non-imprinted primitive, the at least one imprinted primitive and at least one non-imprinted primitive being presented to the user in the number of presentation steps.


As described above, Blonder never teaches or even hints at such a method wherein the user is authenticated as having an authorized access based on his ability *to discriminate between a primitive, previously imprinted to him and a primitive, which was not imprinted to him before*. Furthermore, Blonder never suggests or even hints at the idea of *determining a number of presentation steps, thereby providing variable probability levels for customizable security*.

The remaining claims mentioned in the Office Action are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable main claim.

No new matter is added by the present amendments.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable over the cited reference. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Sol Sheinbein', written over a horizontal line.

Sol Sheinbein
Registration No. 25,457

Date: May 31, 2005

In the Drawings:

Under a letter to the draftsperson, permission is requested to correct Figures 1 and 2 by adding the label "Prior Art" to both figures, as shown in red ink on the attached drawing sheets.